(3) supports the Abuja Accord, and calls on candidates, party officials, and adherents of all political movements to comply with the code of conduct spelled out therein, by refraining from any rhetoric or action that seeks to demonize or delegitimize opponents, sow division among Nigerians, or otherwise inflame tensions;

(4) condemns any and all abuses of civilians by security forces of the Government of Nigeria;

(5) urges the Government of Nigeria to—

(A) adhere to the new timeline for elections announced by INEC on February 7, 2015;

(B) refrain from using security concerns as a pretext for impeding the democratic process and using the security apparatus for political purposes in connection with the elections;

(C) ensure elections are credible, transparent, and peaceful;

(D) prioritize the safety and security of Nigerians vulnerable to Boko Haram attacks;

(E) implement a comprehensive, civilian security-focused response to defeat Boko Haram that addresses political and economic grievances of citizens in the north;

(F) improve the capacity and conduct of Nigeria's security forces, including respect for human rights, and take steps to hold accountable through a transparent process those members of the security forces responsible for abuses;

(G) recognize that security forces are intended to protect the safety and security of all citizens equally; and

(H) cooperate with regional and international partners to defeat Boko Haram;

(6) urges all Nigerians to engage in the electoral process, to insist on full enfranchisement, and to reject inflammatory or divisive rhetoric or actions; and

(7) reaffirms that the people of the United States will continue to stand with the people of Nigeria in support of peace and democracy.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the majority leader, pursuant to the provisions of S. Res. 64, adopted March 5, 2013, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate National Security Working Group for the 114th Congress: MARCO RUBIO of Florida (Republican Administrative Co-Chairman), THAD COCHRAN of Mississippi (Republican Co-Chairman), LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina (Republican Co-Chairman), JEFF SESSIONS of Alabama (Republican Co-Chairman), BOB CORKER of Tennessee, JOHN MCCAIN of Arizona, JAMES RISCH of Idaho, ROY BLUNT of Missouri, and JAMES INHOFE of Oklahoma.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 2015

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, February 25; that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, and the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day; that following leader remarks, the Senate be in a period of morning business for up to 1 hour, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each, with the majority controlling the first half and the Democrats controlling the second half.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order, following the remarks of my colleague from Iowa, Senator GRASSLEY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa.

H–1B VISA PROGRAM

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, many of my colleagues know I have been fighting for years to end the abuse of the H–1B visa program and help disadvantaged U.S. workers who are harmed by that program. Today I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues to a recent incident that highlights how some employers are potentially using legal avenues to import foreign workers, lay off qualified Americans, and then export jobs overseas. I was shocked by the heartless manner in which U.S. workers were injured in the case I am about to describe.

First, I wish to remind my colleagues about how the H–1B program is supposed to work. Under the terms of the H–1B program, U.S. employers may import into the United States each year up to 65,000 so-called specialty occupation workers. The jobs being filled must be a job for which a bachelor's degree is necessary. Even though the annual cap is 65,000, the actual number of foreign workers being imported is much more because of numerous exemptions. In fiscal year 2012, for example, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services approved a total of 262,569 H–1B petitions—way above the legal limit of 65,000 or I should say the supposed limit of 65,000.

About 60 percent of H–1B workers come to fill computer-related occupations. Every year the list of the top 10 H–1B employers is dominated by foreign-based companies offering information technology or IT consulting services to the clients.

Under the law, H–1B employers are also required to: No. 1, pay the workers the greater of the prevailing wage for that job in that area or the wage the employer pays to similarly qualified U.S. workers doing the same job and at the same time—or the No. 2 condition—provide working conditions that will not adversely affect other similarly employed U.S. workers.

Additionally, H–1B employers may not displace a U.S. worker within the period beginning 90 days before and ending 90 days after the date of filing any H–1B petition by that employer.

Now I will describe what the program lacks. Most people believe employers try to recruit Americans before they petition for H–1B workers. Yet under the law, not all employers are required to prove to the Department of Labor that they tried to find an American to fill the job first. That is right. American workers do not get the first chance at these jobs in the United States, and if there is an equally or even better qualified U.S. worker, the company does not have to offer him or her that job.

I have pushed for changes in the legislation in that law. In fact, I offered several pro-U.S. worker amendments during consideration of the immigration bill in 2013. Every amendment I offered was defeated. The majority at that time—meaning the Democratic majority, and it was a bipartisan majority that helped defeat it—defeated these pro-American worker amendments. They pushed through S. 744, the 2013 immigration bill, without this significant, much needed change.

Let me describe to my colleagues the appalling instance referenced above.

I have described what the H–1B law was and how, during the immigration debate of 2013, I tried to amend it and improve it, and I wasn't successful. I started my remarks tonight by talking about the abuse of H–1B, the law not being followed, overseas companies bringing workers in here for an American company to employ, and then in turn these jobs are going to be shipped overseas. So now I wish to describe this appalling incident I referenced earlier.

Last August, Southern California Edison started laying off 400 American workers from its IT department. The company replaced them with foreign H–1B workers. According to the company, 100 additional American workers who will also be replaced by H–1B workers will leave supposedly voluntarily. According to Computerworld, the final major batch of layoffs is scheduled for March 6 or March 7.

The foreign workers who are replacing the American workers at Edison are employees of two overseas-based IT consulting companies that are also two of the largest users of H–1B visas. In 2013 one of the two companies paid the largest immigration fine in U.S. history. That company paid $34 million in a civil settlement after allegations of systemic visa fraud and abuse.

The jobs being filled by H–1B workers are manifestly not jobs for which Americans are unavailable. I say that because the jobs are currently filled by skilled American workers. It is disturbing that not only have these American workers been laid off, but also some of them have reportedly had to train their very own replacements.

A columnist for the Los Angeles Times writes that by laying off hundreds of its American IT staff and replacing them with relatively low-wage foreign contract workers, Edison stands to save as much as 40 percent in wage costs per laid-off worker. One